

**Replies to initial written questions raised by Finance Committee Members in
Examining the Estimates of Expenditure 2006-07**

**Controlling Officer : Judiciary Administrator
Session No. : 16**

Reply Serial No.	Question Serial No.	Name of Member	Head	Programme
JA001	0831	Hon. LI Fung-ying	80	Courts and Tribunals
JA002	0832	Hon. LI Fung-ying	80	Support Services for Courts' Operation
JA003	0833	Hon. LI Fung-ying	80	Courts and Tribunals Support Services for Courts' Operation
JA004	0935	Hon. LEE Chu-ming, Martin	80	Support Services for Courts' Operation
JA005	0936	Hon. LEE Chu-ming, Martin	80	Courts and Tribunals
JA006	0937	Hon. LEE Chu-ming, Martin	80	Courts and Tribunals
JA007	1011	Hon. NG Margaret	80	Courts and Tribunals
JA008	1012	Hon. NG Margaret	80	Courts and Tribunals
JA009	1013	Hon. NG Margaret	80	Support Services for Courts' Operation
JA010	1014	Hon. NG Margaret	80	Courts and Tribunals Support Services for Courts' Operation
JA011	1015	Hon. NG Margaret	80	Support Services for Courts' Operation
JA012	1195	Hon. KWONG Chi-kin	80	Courts and Tribunals
JA013	2032	Hon. LI Kwok-ying	80	Courts and Tribunals
JA014	2143	Hon. WONG Kwok-hing	80	Courts and Tribunals Support Services for Courts' Operation
JA015	2144	Hon. WONG Kwok-hing	80	Courts and Tribunals

**CONTROLLING OFFICER'S REPLY TO
INITIAL WRITTEN QUESTION**

Reply Serial No.

JA001

Question Serial No.

0831

Head: 80 Judiciary

Subhead (No. & title):

Programme: (1) Courts and Tribunals

Controlling Officer: Judiciary Administrator

Director of Bureau: Judiciary Administrator

Question:

It is noted that the actual average waiting time from appointment to filing of a case with the Labour Tribunal in 2004 and 2005 are 8 and 13 days respectively, which are shorter than the target waiting time of 30 days as is originally required. In spite of this, the Judiciary still set the planned average waiting time for 2006 at 30 days. What is the reason for this? Will the Judiciary consider setting the target waiting time for a shorter period of less than 20 days?

Asked by: Hon. LI Fung-ying

Reply:

The planned waiting time of 30 days from appointment booking to filing of claim is our target performance pledge. Although the caseload has decreased, the situation may change rapidly. It is therefore prudent to keep this target for 2006. However, the Labour Tribunal will, as in previous years, continue to strive to achieve an actual waiting time as short as possible.

Signature _____

Name in block letters EMMA LAU

Post Title Judiciary Administrator

Date 13 March 2006

**CONTROLLING OFFICER'S REPLY TO
INITIAL WRITTEN QUESTION**

Reply Serial No.

JA002

Question Serial No.

0832

Head: 80 Judiciary

Subhead (No. & title):

Programme: (2) Support Services for Courts' Operation

Controlling Officer: Judiciary Administrator

Director of Bureau: Judiciary Administrator

Question:

The Judiciary plans to revamp the Labour Tribunal Computer System in September 2006. Please supply information on the objectives, details of the plan and the expenses involved. Will the plan affect the operation of the Labour Tribunal? If it will, please give details, and what measures will be taken to prevent the tribunal's operation from being affected?

Asked by: Hon. LI Fung-ying

Reply:

The revamping of the Labour Tribunal Computer System focuses on four areas :

- (a) the Labour Department will refer claims to the Labour Tribunal electronically, so that the claimants need not repeat their particulars at the Labour Tribunal;
- (b) directions of the Tribunal regarding submission/exchange of documents are captured by the computer system, to which the litigants could access with a code provided to them by the Labour Tribunal;
- (c) awards/orders will be generated by the computer instead of manually as at present; and
- (d) pamphlets and guidelines issued by the Labour Tribunal will be uploaded to the computer for internet access.

The plans, costing about \$3.9m, will not impact on the procedure of the Labour Tribunal but will enhance its efficiency and improve its services to the litigants.

Signature _____

Name in block letters _____ EMMA LAU

Post Title _____ Judiciary Administrator

Date _____ 13 March 2006

**CONTROLLING OFFICER'S REPLY TO
INITIAL WRITTEN QUESTION**

Reply Serial No.

JA003

Question Serial No.

0833

Head: 80 Judiciary

Subhead (No. & title): 000 Operational expenses

Programme: (1) Courts and Tribunals
(2) Support Services for Courts' Operation

Controlling Officer: Judiciary Administrator

Director of Bureau: Judiciary Administrator

Question:

It is estimated that 40 posts will be deleted in 2006-07. What are the posts, ranks, years of service and terms of appointment of the staff involved and in what way will these posts be deleted by the Judiciary? What are the impacts of the reduction in the size of establishment on the operation of the Labour Tribunal? What measures will be taken by the Judiciary to cope with the change to ensure that service will not be affected?

Asked by: Hon. LI Fung-ying

Reply:

The 40 posts intended for deletion in 2006-07 are all vacant permanent posts when they are deleted. No serving staff will be affected. The posts are –

Rank	<u>No. of Posts</u>
Assistant Clerical Officer	16
Clerical Assistant	6
Office Assistant	1
Typist	1
Bailiff's Assistant	6
Head Property Attendant	1
Property Attendant	8
Workman II	1
Total	<u>40</u>

There is no reduction of posts in the Labour Tribunal and hence there is no impact on its operation.

Signature _____
Name in block letters EMMA LAU
Post Title Judiciary Administrator
Date 13 March 2006

**CONTROLLING OFFICER'S REPLY TO
INITIAL WRITTEN QUESTION**

Reply Serial No.

JA004

Question Serial No.

0935

Head: 80 Judiciary

Subhead (No. & title):

Programme: (2) Support Services for Courts' Operation

Controlling Officer: Judiciary Administrator

Director of Bureau: Judiciary Administrator

Question:

With regard to the Resource Centre For Unrepresented Litigants, please (a) give the number of users seeking legal support through the Centre, the size of the establishment, and the actual expenditure in the years 2003, 2004 and 2005 respectively and (b) what are the projected number of users, size of the establishment and expenditure for the year 2006-07?

Asked by: Hon. LEE Chu-ming, Martin

Reply:

The Resource Centre for Unrepresented Litigants commenced operation on 22 December 2003. The information for the years 2004, 2005 and 2006 is as follows :

	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u> (Estimate)
No. of users:			
Visits	4 268	3 877	4 000
Telephone enquiries	2 591	2 746	3 000
Access to webpage	174 968	154 404	160 000
Staff strength:	5	5	5
Approximate expenditure:			
Salaries	\$1,800,000	\$1,800,000	\$1,800,000
Recurrent expenses	\$360,000	\$360,000	\$360,000
Production of videos and brochures	\$820,000	\$120,000	\$200,000

Signature _____

Name in block letters _____ EMMA LAU

Post Title _____ Judiciary Administrator

Date _____ 13 March 2006

**CONTROLLING OFFICER'S REPLY TO
INITIAL WRITTEN QUESTION**

Reply Serial No.

JA005

Question Serial No.

0936

Head: 80 Judiciary

Subhead (No. & title):

Programme: (1) Courts and Tribunals

Controlling Officer: Judiciary Administrator

Director of Bureau: Judiciary Administrator

Question:

The Judiciary stated in the relevant programme that “with the improving economic conditions, the caseload of the Labour Tribunal in 2005 decreased by about 16%”. Why is the waiting time in 2005 longer than that of 2004? And it is anticipated that the waiting time in the year 2006-07 is much longer than the waiting times achieved in the years 2004 and 2005. What is the reason?

Asked by: Hon. LEE Chu-ming, Martin

Reply:

Following the judgment of the Court of First Instance in HCA 6733/1999 (Lajom and Others v Cathay Pacific Airways Limited) in March 2005, the Labour Tribunal received a large number of appointments for filing of claims by employees of a few airline companies. This led to a sudden upsurge of cases and adversely affected the waiting time from appointment booking to filing of claim for a period of about 3 months. As a result, the average waiting time was lengthened. The waiting time returned to a low level again in the latter part of 2005, comparable to that in 2004.

The planned waiting time of 30 days from appointment booking to filing of claim is our target performance pledge. Although the caseload has decreased, the situation may change rapidly. It is therefore prudent to keep this target for 2006. However, the Labour Tribunal will, as in previous years, continue to strive to achieve an actual waiting time as short as possible.

Signature _____

Name in block letters _____ EMMA LAU

Post Title _____ Judiciary Administrator

Date _____ 13 March 2006

**CONTROLLING OFFICER'S REPLY TO
INITIAL WRITTEN QUESTION**

Reply Serial No.

JA006

Question Serial No.

0937

Head: 80 Judiciary

Subhead (No. & title):

Programme: (1) Courts and Tribunals

Controlling Officer: Judiciary Administrator

Director of Bureau: Judiciary Administrator

Question:

Judiciary stated in the relevant programme that more judicial resources have been deployed in the latter part of 2005 with a view to shortening the waiting times for Criminal Fixture List and Civil Fixture List. However, the waiting times of the said two types of cases in the Court of First Instance in 2005 still far exceed their respective target waiting times. Judiciary anticipated that the waiting time for the Criminal Fixture List in 2006 will still be longer than the target waiting time. Will the Judiciary undertake any work process enhancement initiatives in 2006-07 to further shorten the waiting times of the said two types of cases in the Court of First Instance? If yes, please give details.

Asked by: Hon. LEE Chu-ming. Martin

Reply:

The Judiciary has deployed additional resources to increase the number of deputy judges in the High Court over the last six months. Plans are also in hand to enhance temporary judicial resources further in the High Court in 2006-07, and to start recruiting High Court Judges later this year. These measures would help shorten the waiting times for the Criminal Fixture List and the Civil Fixture List and to keep them within reasonable periods.

Signature _____

Name in block letters EMMA LAU

Post Title Judiciary Administrator

Date 13 March 2006

**CONTROLLING OFFICER'S REPLY TO
INITIAL WRITTEN QUESTION**

Reply Serial No.

JA007

Question Serial No.

1011

Head: 80 Judiciary

Subhead (No. & title):

Programme: (1) Courts and Tribunals

Controlling Officer: Judiciary Administrator

Director of Bureau: Judiciary Administrator

Question:

Significant failure to meet the target is noted on nearly all level of courts, but particularly in the Court of First Instance where the length of time from filing of indictment to hearing was 193 days for the Criminal Fixture List, and 233 days from application to fix date to hearing in the Civil Fixture List. At the same time, there is a – 4.4% difference between the Originals and Revised estimate of 2005-2006. (a) What was the reason for the reduction and how did it affect performance? (b) Please explain whether the estimate for 2006-07 has taken into account the need to improve and if so what is proposed to be done. (c) Please provide information on the length of time between the conclusion of trial and judgment by level of courts, as compared to target, if any.

Asked by: Hon. NG Margaret

Reply:

- (a) The reduction in requirements of 4.4% (\$30.9M) in the revised estimate of 2005-06 against the original estimate is mainly due to vacancies (\$27.3M) and the decrease in cashflow requirements for non-recurrent and capital projects (\$3.8M). The vacancies include both judicial and non-judicial posts. To ensure that the Judiciary is provided with adequate resources to deliver judicial services of high quality and to avoid further worsening of the court waiting times, the Judiciary has decided to defreeze recruitment of judges and judicial officers (JJOs) and to appoint additional deputy JJOs to cope with the judicial work, and to provide the necessary support to the additional JJOs. To this end, the Judiciary has deployed additional

resources to increase the number of deputy JJOs over the last six months, and started the recruitment of Permanent Magistrates in November 2005. Plans are also in hand to start recruiting District Judges and High Court Judges later this year.

- (b) Provision has been included in 2006-07 to recruit JJOs (\$18.5M), to appoint additional deputy JJOs (\$5.9M) and to provide additional support staff and services (\$3.7M).
- (c) Information on the length of time between the conclusion of hearing and judgment in respect of civil and criminal appeals to the Court of Final Appeal and the Court of Appeal, magisterial and minor appeals to the Court of First Instance, and civil trials in the Court of First Instance and the District Court is set out in the following table.

<u>Court Level</u>	<u>Average time (days) taken from conclusion of trial/appeal to delivery of judgment/decision in 2005</u>
Court of Final Appeal	
Civil appeal	23
Criminal appeal	18
Court of Appeal	
Civil appeal	11
Criminal appeal	4
Court of First Instance	
Magisterial appeal	5
Minor appeal*	17
Civil trial	32
District Court	
Civil trial	26

Note: Minor appeals include Small Claims Tribunal appeals, Labour Tribunal appeals, Inland Revenue appeals and Minor Employment Claims appeals.

The Judiciary does not maintain similar statistics on criminal trials as the verdicts are usually given at the conclusion of trial immediately or within a relatively short time after conclusion of trial. For proceedings in the Small Claims Tribunal and the Labour Tribunal, oral judgments are also usually given immediately after trial.

The Judiciary has not set target times for delivery or handing down of reserved judgments after trial. As stated in the Guide to Judicial Conduct, judges should deliver reserved judgments within a reasonable time, taking into account the complexity of the matter and other work commitments.

Signature

Name in block letters

EMMA LAU

Post Title

Judiciary Administrator

Date

13 March 2006

**CONTROLLING OFFICER'S REPLY TO
INITIAL WRITTEN QUESTION**

Reply Serial No.

JA008

Question Serial
No.

1012

Head: 80 Judiciary

Subhead (No. & title):

Programme: (1) Courts and Tribunals

Controlling Officer: Judiciary Administrator

Director of Bureau: Judiciary Administrator

Question:

It is explained in Note 5 that the average waiting time for civil cases in the District Court has increased considerably in 2005 due to the increased in the length of civil trials and the complexity of the cases. What provision has been made to control and reduce the waiting time in the 2006 estimate?

Asked by: Hon. NG Margaret

Reply:

The waiting time from the date of listing to hearing of civil cases in the District Court was 120 days in 2005. This was still within target. Nevertheless, in order to shorten the waiting time as far as practicable, the Judiciary has deployed additional resources to increase the number of civil judges in the District Court by appointing deputy judges over the last six months. Plans are also in hand to enhance temporary judicial resources further in the District Court, and to start recruiting District Judges later this year.

Signature _____

Name in block letters _____ EMMA LAU

Post Title _____ Judiciary Administrator

Date _____ 13 March 2006

**CONTROLLING OFFICER'S REPLY TO
INITIAL WRITTEN QUESTION**

Reply Serial No.

JA009

Question Serial No.

1013

Head: 80 Judiciary

Subhead (No. & title):

Programme: (2) Support Services for Courts' Operation

Controlling Officer: Judiciary Administrator

Director of Bureau: Judiciary Administrator

Question:

Please explain the reasons for the reduction of 8.6% in the Revised 2005-06 estimate and the increase of 2.2% in the 2006-07 estimate.

Asked by: Hon NG Margaret

Reply:

The decrease of 8.6% (\$20.6M) in the Revised 2005-06 estimate is mainly due to vacancies (\$9.6M) arising from natural wastage and deployment of staff out of the Judiciary Administration, reduced requirements for hire of services (\$7.7M) and decrease in general departmental expenses (\$4.4M); partly offset by an increase in Law Library Acquisition (\$2.3M).

The increase of 2.2% (\$4.9M) in the 2006-07 estimates is mainly due to filling of some vacancies, salary increments and acting allowances for staff, and employment of temporary staff.

Signature _____

Name in block letters EMMA LAU

Post Title Judiciary Administrator

Date 13 March 2006

**CONTROLLING OFFICER'S REPLY TO
INITIAL WRITTEN QUESTION**

JA010

1014

Head: 80 Judiciary

Subhead (No. & title):

Programme: (1) Courts and Tribunals
(2) Support Services for Courts' Operation

Controlling Officer: Judiciary Administrator

Director of Bureau: Judiciary Administrator

Question:

The size of the establishment of the Judiciary shrank from 1802 in 2003 to 1747 in 2004, to 1641 in 2005, 1591 in 2006, and estimated to shrink further to 1551 in 2007. Please provide :

- (a) the breakdown of judicial and non-judicial posts reduced by level of court; and
- (b) the reason for the continued decrease, particularly in light of the increasing workload, longer trials and greater complexity of the cases, and the significant fall from target.

Asked by: Hon. NG Margaret

Reply:

- (a) Apart from the lapse of 1 supernumerary post of Justice of Appeal of the Court of Appeal of the High Court in September 2003, there has not been any reduction in the permanent establishment in respect of judicial posts in the years under question. The said supernumerary post of Justice of Appeal of the Court of Appeal was originally created for accommodating the replacement of a Justice of Appeal appointed as Chairman of the Electoral Affairs Commission (EAC). Due to the change in work requirements of the EAC, a full post was no longer needed for the new term of office of the Chairman of EAC commencing September 2003.

As regards support staff, a total of 210 posts would have been deleted from 2003-04 to 2005-06. All these 210 posts are vacant posts when they

are deleted. Distribution of these 210 non-judicial posts in different courts as well as sections supporting courts' operation is as follows –

	<u>No. of Posts</u>
(i) Court of Final Appeal	4
(ii) High Court	7
(iii) District Court	10
(iv) Magistrates' Courts / Tribunals	101
(v) Supporting Sections	88
Total	<u>210</u>

In 2006-07, it is planned that the following 40 vacant non-judicial posts will be deleted from the Magistrates' Courts and sections supporting courts' operations –

	<u>No. of Posts</u>
(i) Magistrates' Courts	6
(ii) Supporting Sections	34
Total	<u>40</u>

- (b) Over the years, the Judiciary has adopted a number of measures to achieve the saving target set by the Administration, mainly through rationalization of resources; re-alignment of management structure; and streamlining, re-engineering and re-prioritization of work. The reduction of 250 non-judicial posts has resulted from these measures and these posts have been gradually vacated upon natural wastage of the incumbents through normal retirement, participation in the second voluntary retirement scheme or re-deployment out of the Judiciary. However, having reviewed the long waiting time for cases to be heard in courts, the Judiciary has planned to start appointing additional Judges and Judicial Officers (JJOs) and has been increasing temporary judicial resources for various levels of courts. To provide support for these additional JJOs, adequate support staff will be engaged.

Signature	
Name in block letters	EMMA LAU
Post Title	Judiciary Administrator
Date	13 March 2006

**CONTROLLING OFFICER'S REPLY TO
INITIAL WRITTEN QUESTION**

Reply Serial No.

JA011

Question Serial No.

1015

Head: 80 Judiciary

Subhead (No. & title):

Programme: (2) Support Services for Courts' Operation

Controlling Officer: Judiciary Administrator

Director of Bureau: Judiciary Administrator

Question:

Please provide the expenditure on the Resource Centre of the High Court, and the rate of its usage by members of the public.

Asked by: Hon. NG Margaret

Reply:

The Resource Centre for Unrepresented Litigants commenced operation on 22 December 2003. The information for the years 2004, 2005 and 2006 is as follows :

	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u> (Estimate)
No. of users:			
Visits	4 268	3 877	4 000
Telephone enquiries	2 591	2 746	3 000
Access to webpage	174 968	154 404	160 000
Staff strength:	5	5	5
Approximate expenditure:			
Salaries	\$1,800,000	\$1,800,000	\$1,800,000
Recurrent expenses	\$360,000	\$360,000	\$360,000
Production of videos and brochures	\$820,000	\$120,000	\$200,000

Signature _____

Name in block letters EMMA LAU

Post Title Judiciary Administrator

Date 13 March 2006

**CONTROLLING OFFICER'S REPLY TO
INITIAL WRITTEN QUESTION**

Reply Serial No.

JA012

Question Serial No.

1195

Head: 80 Judiciary

Subhead (No. & title):

Programme: (1) Courts and Tribunals

Controlling Officer: Judiciary Administrator

Director of Bureau: Judiciary Administrator

Question:

With regard to the 8 273 cases and 6 900 cases that the Labour Tribunal dealt with in 2004 and 2005, will the Government inform this Panel:

- a) the number of cases of which the claims were made against employers and the number of cases of which the claims were made against employees;
- b) the amount of claims and the number of litigants involved in each case;
- c) the respective numbers of claims which were settled, withdrawn, allowed and dismissed;
- d) which three fields of trade make up the largest number of labour claims filed;
- e) the number of cases which had to be transferred to the District Court, the High Court and the Small Claims Tribunal and the reasons for transfer of trial, with a breakdown by category?

Asked by: Hon. KWONG Chi-kin

Reply:

	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>
(a) Number of cases filed:		
• by employees	7 888	6 588
• by employees in which counterclaims were lodged by employers	322	253
• by employers	63	59
	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>
(b) Amount of claims (excluding claims for compensation to be assessed)	\$1,035m	\$979m
Number of litigants:		
• Claimants	20 230	15 130
• Defendants	11 261	9 001

	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>
(c) Number of cases:		
• settled	4 892	3 758
• withdrawn	1 043	836
• awarded	2 195	1 591
• dismissed	435	350
(d) The Judiciary does not have available information on the fields of trade of the labour claims.		
	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>
(e) Number of cases:		
• transferred to the High Court	15	12
• transferred to the District Court	29	19
• transferred to the Small Claims Tribunal	13	4

The Judiciary does not have available information on the reasons for transfer.

Signature _____

Name in block letters EMMA LAU

Post Title Judiciary Administrator

Date 13 March 2006

**CONTROLLING OFFICER'S REPLY TO
INITIAL WRITTEN QUESTION**

Reply Serial No.

JA013

Question Serial No.

2032

Head: 80 Judiciary

Subhead (No. & title): 000 Operational expenses

Programme: (1) Courts and Tribunals

Controlling Officer: Judiciary Administrator

Director of Bureau: Judiciary Administrator

Question:

The Administration is going to make a law for the purpose of regulating the conduct of interception of communications and covert surveillance. Under the legislative proposals, the authorizing authority for most of the operations would be vested in a Judge. The Judiciary is thus faced with the urgent need of recruiting additional manpower. That being the case, have any financial provisions been made in the 2006-07 estimate in the light of the additional resources so required? If no, what appropriate arrangements will be made by the Judiciary within the general context of the existing resources (Please see the Panel Paper attached)?

Asked by: Hon. LI Kwok-ying

Reply:

No financial provisions have been earmarked in the 2006-07 estimates for the Judiciary to undertake the additional functions arising from the Administration's legislative proposals concerning interception of communications and covert surveillance.

If the legislative proposals are enacted and implemented, it would be necessary to provide the Judiciary with sufficient resources. The Administration is aware of the Judiciary's position on adequate resources required. The Judiciary is in continuing discussion with the Administration on this matter.

Signature _____

Name in block letters Miss Emma Lau

Post Title Judiciary Administrator

Date 13 March 2006

**CONTROLLING OFFICER'S REPLY TO
INITIAL WRITTEN QUESTION**

Reply Serial No.

JA014

Question Serial No.

2143

Head: 80 Judiciary

Subhead (No. & title): 000 Operational expenses

Programme: (1) Courts and Tribunals
(2) Support Services for Courts' Operation

Controlling Officer: Judiciary Administrator

Director of Bureau: Judiciary Administrator

Question:

In 2006-07, the Judiciary will delete 40 posts, please provide information on :-

- (a) the titles, ranks and number of the posts to deleted;
- (b) the reasons for the deletion;
- (c) the redistribution arrangement of the work originally taken up by the holders of such posts;
- (d) the anticipated amount of savings of expenses; and
- (e) whether such amount will be allocated in full for provision of departmental operating expenses.

Asked by: Hon. Wong Kwok-hing

Reply:

- (a) The 40 posts to be deleted in 2006-07 are all vacant permanent posts when they are deleted. The posts are –

Rank	<u>No. of Posts</u>
Assistant Clerical Officer	16
Clerical Assistant	6
Office Assistant	1
Typist	1
Bailiff's Assistant	6
Head Property Attendant	1
Property Attendant	8
Workman II	1
Total	<u>40</u>

- (b)&(c) Over the years, the Judiciary has introduced a number of efficiency initiatives to make optimal use of resources through rationalization of resources; re-alignment of management structure; and streamlining, re-engineering and re-prioritization of work. The 40 posts scheduled for deletion in 2006-07 have resulted from these initiatives and have been vacated upon natural wastage or re-deployment of the incumbents out of the Judiciary.
- (d) Most of these 40 posts have been vacant for some time with only eight to be vacated by the end of 2006-07. The reduction of these 40 posts would result in a savings of about \$5.73 million in notional annual mid-point salary value. In effect, the actual savings of these eight posts will be around \$420,000.
- (e) Financial provision for posts which are still filled in 2005-06 has not been deducted from Judiciary's financial provision for 2006-07.

Signature

Name in block letters

EMMA LAU

Post Title

Judiciary Administrator

Date

13 March 2006

**CONTROLLING OFFICER'S REPLY TO
INITIAL WRITTEN QUESTION**

Reply Serial No.

JA015

Question Serial No.

2144

Head: 80 Judiciary

Subhead (No. & title): 661 Minor plant, vehicles and equipment (block vote)

Programme: (1) Courts and Tribunals

Controlling Officer: Judiciary Administrator

Director of Bureau: Judiciary Administrator

Question:

Provision for 2006-07 under this Subhead will increase by 465.2%, which will be mainly used for the replacement of fire services installation in three court buildings. Please set out:

- (a) Which three court buildings need a replacement of fire services installation;
- (b) How much expenditure will be involved in relation to each court building; and
- (c) How long will each project take?

Asked by: Hon WONG Kwok-hing

Reply:

- (a) The fire services installation in the Tuen Mun Law Courts Building, Lands Tribunal and Kwun Tong Law Courts Building will be replaced in 2006-07.
- (b) The estimated expenditure for each court building is as follows -
 - (i) Tuen Mun Law Courts Building: \$ 951,200;
 - (ii) Lands Tribunal: \$170,800; and
 - (iii) Kwun Tong Law Courts Building: \$ 174,000.
- (c) Each replacement project would take about 6 months to complete.

Signature _____

Name in block letters EMMA LAU

Post Title Judiciary Administrator

Date 13 March 2006